DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 382 135 HE 028 336

AUTHOR Mauch, James E.; And Others
TITLE Institutional Planning for Emeritus Faculty.
PUB DATE [90]
NOTE 25p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Rank (Professional); Aging in Academia; Collective Bargaining; *College Administration; College Faculty; *Faculty College Relationship; Faculty Development; Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; Part Time Faculty; *Personnel Policy; Planning; Retirement; Retirement Benefits
IDENTIFIERS *Emeritus Professors

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on significant developments in the meaning and function of emeritus rank in college faculties and discusses related issues in college planning affected by these changes. History and use of the term "emeritus," concepts on aging, and faculty views on emeritus status are examined; and the development of emeritus status as a basis for a new working professional rank is explored. Illustrations from legislative and professional body actions to document administrative and faculty problems and benefits with this rank are included. Suggestions are offered to help institutions of higher education plan for possible growth in numbers of emeritus faculty, by providing for the needs of these individuals, to the benefit of both the institution and the individual faculty member. Also explored is the relationship of emeritus status with collective bargaining agreements, maintenance of the tenure system, retirement incentives, economic and academic benefits to higher education, and the need for faculty development and evaluation. The paper ends with a series of conclusions from the literature and recommendations, chief of which is that institutions should change the previous "emeritus professor" image from a rank of retired faculty to a new form of working rank, which, though part-time, is equally distinguished and productive. (Contains 87 references.) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 382 135

INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING FOR EMERITUS FACULTY

By

James E. Mauch, Jack W. Birch, and Jack Matthews
University of Pittsburgh

ABSTRACT

This paper will report on significant developments in the literature on the emeritus rank. In the paper, the history and usage of the term emeritus is examined, and the development of emeritus status as a basis for a new working professional rank is explored. Illustrations from legislative and professional body actions to document administrative and faculty problems and benefits are included. Included also are guides to help institutions of higher education plan for possible growth in numbers of emeriti faculty, by providing for the needs of emeriti, to the benefit of the institution and the individual faculty member.

Also explored is the relationship of emeritus status with collective bargaining agreements, maintenance of the tenure system, retirement incentives, economic and academic benefits to higher education, and the need for faculty development and evaluation.

HE 024 336

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James Mauch

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING FOR EMERITUS FACULTY

Serious proposals have been published in an effort to establish, in operational terms, what rights and responsibilities should inhere in the emeritus status (Albert 1986). Faculty members with emeritus rank, vigorously active and alert in personal, professional and scholarly matters, are making their voices heard in new and constructive ways, to the benefit of the academic community as a whole (Riley 1986; Peterson et al, undated; Auerbach 1986, a, b, c). For many faculty, retirement no longer means withdrawal from active work at one's primary career. Instead, the option is open to continue what one has been doing, in various respects, at one's own pace and under newly negotiated terms. It is time to begin a broader review of this potential redefinition of faculty retirement.

Faculty members may be in the early stages of awareness about age uncapping and its implications for their retirement planning. The impact of uncapping promises to be a growing topic of interest to tenured faculty members who face a future without a mandatory age requirement. Financial responsibilities and changes in perceptions are involved, too.

> "Views about the relative advantages of work and leisure and various combinations thereof may change as a person ages. The views of one's future preference between work and leisure held at age 60 are likely to be quite different from what they turn out to be at age 65 or 70" (Soldofsky 1986, p. 23).

The emerging changes in the role and function of the emeritus professor may well presage a major modification in the conventional professorial rank structure in higher education (Albert 1986). There is concern about how to maintain the positive elements in both the tenure system and the present operating retirement schemes while accommodating to a new condition, namely, the elimination of any mandatory retirement age (Finkin 1989). Higher education groups of almost all kinds and persuasions are preoccupied with one or another facet of that problem (Heller 1986; Holden and Hansen 1989).

This review will examine the interactions among the above concerns. Also, the review will result in recommendations for actions by responsible agencies and groups, and suggest areas for further investigation.

REALITIES ABOUT THE AGING PROFESSORATE

Reports about elderly people occupy increasing proportions both of radio and television time and of all forms of periodical print material. Popular publications and scholarly writing about oldsters occupy more and more of the time of creative persons. Local, state, national and international political leaders seek support from senior citizen constituencies and develop legislation to address the social consequences of the steadily extending human life span. Public concern is high, and the body of knowledge about aging multiplies.

Summarized below are several key concepts about aging culled from existing literature. These concepts about aging are of central importance when considering emerging roles for emeritus faculty. They must be faced by those leaders among faculty and administration who are responsible for searching out accommodations that are both honorable and pragmatic ways to adjust policies and practices to imminent changes in the emeritus professor population.

Life Span and Economic Implications: Americans are living longer. Persons reaching age 65 in 1989 had an average life expectancy of 20 years. Four years earlier, in 1985, the life expectancy of a 65 year old was 17 years. Thus, it is plain that faculty members need to plan for increasing life expectancies and for the heightened likelihood that, when retired, they will need self support funds for a longer period of time, plus provision for escalating living costs (Committee on Aging 1986; Pifer and Bronte 1985; Ycas 1987). Moreover, they could well become members of four or five generation families. Older faculty members may have to care, socially and economically, for their own aging parents while also giving financial assistance to younger kin, in increasing degrees. At present, for example, elderly people are four times as likely to give financial aid to their offspring as they are to receive it from them. One obvious possible solution for professors is to extend the years of earning prior to full retirement.

Health and Intellect: Today, people 70 years of age are substantially more healthy and intellectually active than those of previous generations. People attain their 60's, 70's and 80's in better general condition than did previous generations. Also, health and productivity are positively connected. Hence it is imperative that higher education planners upgrade realistically their conceptions of "typical" persons in the sixth, seventh and later decades of life rather than maintain stereotypes based on their observations of retirees of decades past or even of current retirees. Physical and mental vigor remain for adults into advanced years, and the upper limits have not yet been ascertained. (Committee on Aging 1986; Ycas 1987).

Growing Numbers: According to the Committee on Ageing (1986), the U.S. population over age 65 has been increasing at more than twice the rate for persons under 65 (2.5% per year versus 1% per year). Such a differential rate of increase suggests that the number of faculty members eligible to enter the emeritus ranks may be out-growing annually the number of scholars and professionals eligible for initial employment as faculty members. Certainly there will be variance in growth among the many academic and professional disciplines. However, the over-all picture appears to be one that will affect faculty shortages if present retirement practices with respect to age continue.

Differences Among Older Persons: Education increases individual differences. The robust intellect continues to increase in power over most of its lifetime. Recent gerontological thinking tends to assign the over 65's into three groups (though there is much overlap). People aged 65 to 74 are generally active and healthy, usually well able to carry on whatever managerial, intellectual and creative activities they engaged in before 65. A number become even more productive during those years. Individuals from 75 to 84 differ from the first group chiefly in pace of activities, with little or no loss of skills or intellectual vigor. Many have lost spouses,and have adopted a more moderate lifestyle out· of choice, not necessity. The over-85 group, increasing in numbers, is less well understood. It does appear that approximately half of them continue in very much the same life style as the 75-84 age cohort. The remainder seem to move more and more into what has been called a "retired life pattern," with some level of care provided by others in areas of personal and home management. That contrasts with less than 15% of the 65-74's needing such support (Committee on Aging 1986; Pifer and Bronte 1986).

The above "stages of aging" description by gerontologists and the evidence about older persons' intellectual integrity and continued development dispute the notion of general debility and loss of competence with increasing age. From all indications older persons are, as a class, becoming smarter, healthier and more productive. Elderly people today are more competent than their counterparts of past generations.

FACULTY VIEWS OF EMERITUS STATUS

A study of Canadian faculty in Ontario (Hansen, B.L., 1985) suggested that, contrary to the findings of Chronister and Kepple (1987), early retirement is viewed as one of the least attractive options to faculty. Hansen found that over a 10 year period approximately 125 Ontario faculty elected to take retirement. This averaged about 10 per year from a faculty complement of between 10,000 and 11,000, in percentage terms about 0.1% per year. Universities in Ontario have been permitted to retire faculty at age 65, although that is now being tested in the courts.

In speculating on why early retirement has been so unattractive to faculty, Hansen's instinctive answer is that academics have jobs that give them a lot of satisfaction. Faculty do not easily abandon congenial work prematurely when the costs of abandonment in financial and psychic terms are high. This seems to be supported in Ontario by the evidence of greater use of reduced time, leave without pay, and assignment to other institutions, which allow faculty to remain in familiar work situations with reduced commitments, or with a guarantee to return later (Hansen 1985).

Those faculty members who have written about emeritus status seem to point to an active professional life style, not unlike their working life, but a bit less hectic, with less pressure from classes and students and more time to devote to travel and their own professional interests and research (Auerbach, 1986b; Dorfman, 1985; Havighurst,1985; Kellams & Chronister, 1988; Trice, 1981). If this is accurate, it might mean that institutions could plan to put real meaning and distinctiveness into the rank, and reserve it for the most active and interested faculty. Faculty, on the other hand, might be more likely to treat the rank as a meaningful opportunity to make additional contributions, rather than simply an honorific title.

Other considerations for faculty may be more mundane. For example, some are ready to retire but feel they cannot because of loss of health benefits which they or a family member depend on. If emeritus status in some way helped in continuing health, and perhaps other benefits, they might retire immediately. Among TIAA institutions, many colleges and universities do not continue retired employees in their group health insurance plans, and of those that do most have some eligibility requirements, and most require the retired faculty member to pay either the full cost, or most of the cost (TIAA-CREF October 1988).

An informative way of investigating what faculty want when they envision emeritus status is to look at what colleges offer to entice older scholars to retire. Some colleges and universities are finding ways to keep faculty active in retirement, whether the motivation is to retire them, or to retain the services of those they would rather not lose. Other institutions provide opportunity to retire gradually, allowing faculty to reduce workload gradually over time. These colleges offer faculty what they want, office and laboratory space, secretarial help, library and parking privileges, and opportunities to teach and work with students part time. One of the biggest fears faculty have about retirement is that they will be cut off from colleagues and students, and the rich intellectual environment they are used to, and avoiding this separation is what is wanted in emeritus status (Blum 1988; Managan 1988).

Albert (1986) writes about a redefinition of retirement and emeritus status. As chair, Committee E of the California Conference of AAUP, he carried out a charge from that conference to make recommendations concerning the role of emeriti in university life. The document was characterized as an emeriti bill of rights, and it begins with the concept of conferring emeritus status as an act of recognition of a long and meritorious service, and sees it as an earned rank, carrying with it certain rights.

Among the emeritus rights, paraphrased from Albert's list, are items that one would ordinarily expect such as, pre-retirement information, instruction, and counseling on financial and social issues associated with retirement, receipt of news about the institution, access to post-retirement counseling and guidance, faculty club membership, faculty dining privileges, use of campus recreational and social facilities, admission to athletic, dramatic, film, musical and other cultural events of the institution, credit union services, access to college and alumni travel programs, and retirement faculty identification cards. These would be expected to involve little or no incremental cost to the institution, and may well be available to all retired faculty.

A second group of rights and responsibilities, provided in addition to those above, would be a step up in terms of institutional cost and commitment, and in terms of restricting such rights to emeritus faculty. They would include emeritus faculty listings in college directories and catalogs, emeritus identification cards providing library privileges, emeritus faculty parking privileges, receipt of campus publications and notices, departmental mail addresses, participation in ceremonies and academic processions, attendance at faculty meetings and faculty functions, opportunity to audit courses, use of the college guest house, faculty discounts at the university press and book store, and the opportunity to teach part time if needed.

Emeritus status of this nature would certainly be of value to faculty, yet not involve a great deal of commitment on the part of either the individual or the institution. Where costs are involved, they may well be borne by the individual if employed faculty are also charged, e.g., parking or campus events. In this case costs to the institution may be minimal.

The third area of emeritus rights is more substantial, and institutions may limit items to a group of emeritus faculty who want to continue their campus teaching, research, and other activities, and who are welcomed in that role by the institution. This emeritus rank would include the availability of negotiated teaching and advising assignments, laboratory and other research resources, departmental office space, telephone, secretarial services, computers, word processors, stationery, supplies, mailing privileges, and other resources. This rank of emeritus faculty would, in pursuing research, have the right to receive and administer grants, contracts, awards, and other funded research projects. As emeritus faculty they would have help in producing scholarly publications, in making research and other grant proposals, and in making presentations at professional meetings. They would be able to serve on thesis and dissertation committees, on departmental committees, on campus or state faculty committees, on the campus speaker roster, to serve the institution in a variety of advisory or consultant capacities, and to participate in seminars, colloquia, lectures, and other scholarly meetings (Albert 1986).

Finally, there are a number of "rights" emeriti seek with respect to associating with one another. Albert (1986) mentions the right to establish an association of emeritus faculty on campus, to establish an emeritus faculty center on campus, to use campus meeting rooms for association meetings, and to have representation of emeritus faculty, or their association, on Senate and faculty councils.

Another indication of faculty desires comes from the AAUP (1988, p. 38) position which is moving toward recognition of phased retirement plans which enable faculty to negotiate reductions in services and salary acceptable to them and the institution. AAUP further states that:

> Each institution should help retired faculty members and administrators remain a part of the academic community, and facilitate timely retirement, by providing, where possible, such amenities as a mail address, library privileges, office space, faculty club membership, the institution's publications, secretarial help, administration of grants, research facilities, faculty dining and parking privileges, and participation in convocations and academic processions. Institutions that confer emeritus status should do so in accordance with standards determined by the faculty and administration.

There are people who are beginning to write about a changing role, and that may be a sign of change to come (Albert 1986; COFHE 1987; AAUP 1988). Four changes are clear. First, the number of emeriti faculty is large and growing. Second, emeriti are becoming more assertive about what they look upon as their rights (Albert 1986). Third, emeriti are attaining recognition in policy statements of major professional organizations (AAUP 1988). And fourth, emeriti are organizing themselves and conducting conferences with themes arising from self-interest (Albert 1988; Auerbach 1986; Blum 1988). Taken together, these moves seem to set the stage for more visible and, possibly, a more influential role for emeriti in higher education in the future.

A NEW ROLE FOR THE PROFESSOR EMERITUS

Predicting future enrollments, availability of faculty and likely age of faculty retirement is less than an exact science, but the prospects for uncapping of the mandatory retirement age has made the need for solid data more critical. Even when there is more solid information planning efforts will have a margin of error. Neither the data generated by the survey of AAU members and Pennsylvania degree-granting institutions (Mauch, Birch, & Matthews, 1989a, 1989b) nor the results of the literature search can furnish more than general guidelines and suggestions concerning new data needed for the process of planning for the decade ahead.

There is evidence that in the decade of the 90's there may not be a glut of qualified faculty (Bowen and Shuster 1986; Lozier and Dooris 1987). The coming decades may also be a period during which higher education will continue to cope with costs which rise at a rate above the general increase in cost of living.

While there seems to be agreement as to the trend of faculty members retiring in increasing numbers, many faculty will not want to withdraw totally from active work. They will welcome an opportunity to continue what they have been doing but at their own pace--and for some, under newly negotiated terms of employment. The possibilities are with us for a new form of working rank for the emeritus professor in which competence and experience built up over the years will continue to be utilized by higher education at a price higher education can afford. The new emeritus professor may not be expecting a continuation of the salary or the pressures and responsibilities experienced prior to being elevated to emeritus rank.

The new emeritus rank should offer such flexibility that it will prove to be an attractive option, one that does not deprive higher education of the continued services of productive faculty. The change can be one that leads from an historical "emeritus professor" image, honorific, distinguished, retired, to a new image of working rank, equally distinguished, but accenting productivity as well.

Prototypes of the new emeritus rank. For more than 30 years information has been accumulating that portrays some emeritus professors in active, functioning roles (Benz 1958). Emeritus faculty and their institutions, such as the following examples, and the summaries of reports and investigations that follow, lend credence to the notion that a significant number of more competent senior faculty members might be willing to take formal retirement, but still stay on to play important parts on campus, if their institutions assured them of continuing benefits tailored to their individual needs.

Ralph S. Brown, professor emeritus of law at Yale, is one example. Another is Gordon A. Craig, professor emeritus of history at Stanford. Professor Brown teaches part-time at another law school and he has an office at Yale. He points out that if one is forced to give up an office on retirement, that might be annoying enough to encourage staying right on as, perhaps, a not very enthusiastic teacher. Professor Craig acknowledges warmly Stanford's continued support and interest in him during 10 years of "formal" retirement. He has taught at Stanford half-time during six of those 10 years, has an office on campus, has authored books, has received a Ford Foundation grant, and maintains an otherwise active schedule (Magnan 1988).

Professor of biology, Frederick N. Crescitelli of UCLA became an emeritus professor at age 70. Thinking back at age 79 he reflected that acquiring the emeritus title simply meant that he could continue, though not as an active faculty member, without a break in his work. He teaches occasionally, guest lectures in regular classes, adds to his research on retinal pigmentation, and is writing a book about his investigations. Professor Crescitelli has an office and access to laboratory facilities and he is eligible for many other emeriti benefits simply by showing a special identification card (Blum 1988).

Beloit College geology professor Henry G. Woodard, at age 62, opted to be part of a four-year program that let him phase into retirement. To start, he paired with a younger colleague and shared a teaching load. That gave him increased time for research and reflection (Magnan 1988). At UCLA professor Thomas W. James who took part in a phased move to emeritus status, remarked that the phase arrangement has advantages two ways. First, faculty members are given time and opportunity to make thoughtful and deliberate decisions about how to spend their later years and to test some alternatives. Second, during the phasing, and perhaps longer, the university continues to have and enjoy a valued human resource, the productive senior teacher, scholar and researcher (Blum 1988).

The relationship of the new emeritus rank relate to existing ranks. The following conception of the emeritus status as a rank, integrated into the conventional working rank structure of assistant, associate and full professor reflects a proposal first introduced into the literature by Mirel (1977). It also includes components suggested by Albert (1986) and by Mauch, Birch and Matthews (1988a and b).

The Professor Emeritus rank would be awarded in the same fashion as are other earned ranks. That is, a departmental recommendation would be processed through whatever committees and administrative and trustee procedures are used in the institution to award any other professorial rank.

Though the professor emeritus rank is academically the equal of full professor, certain qualifications make it distinctively different from the full professorship in structural ways.

1. The emeritus professorship denotes that the faculty member is employed less than full-time.
2. The emeritus professorship is an appointment at a fractional or part-time salary level.
3. The move to emeritus rank is a transfer rather than a promotion.
4. The conditions of employment at emeritus rank are individually negotiated between the faculty member and the institutional representative regarding tenure, contracts, schedule, duties, salary, benefits, prerequisites, and the like prior to transfer to emeritus status.
5. Most conditions of employment may be renegotiated upon the initiative of either party from year to year.
6. Any full professor with five or more years of service at the institution may apply for emeritus status after age 55.
7. Upon full retirement the holder of emeritus rank may employ the title indefinitely.

Expanded contributions of the professor emeritus to higher education. There is in the literature a thread running through expressed desires of emeriti: to be kept informed, to be the recipient of important communications, to be treated as one of the academic community, an honored member of the academy. Many wish to continue, also, in the roles they have had, with modifications in pressure and time (Havighurst 1985; Holden 1985).

The benefit to the institution may be great. After all, faculty who have spent their life at an institution often feel an emotional and academic attachment every bit as strong as alumni, and they want to keep in touch and to contribute of their time and goods. They are certainly a valuable group of potential contributors. Of course, not all faculty have the same feeling toward their college, but those who do are a rich resource.

In order to determine roles of emeriti it would seem essential to distinguish among retiring faculty in some way that would be appropriate, and that would involve the institution as well as the faculty member. For example, in establishing a meaningful rank of emeritus professor, an institution may establish criteria to be met by those who wish to join that rank.

Clearly in such a scheme not all would wish to join, nor would all be eligible. It may well be that there would be one group of retiring faculty who will take their retirement pay, and never darken the door of the academy again. A second group will likely be those who, for whatever reasons, want only a minimum of continuing relationship.

The third group is the emeritus faculty, a group that does not look forward to retirement if that means being cut off permanently from colleagues, friends, the profession, research, students, reading, writing, analyzing, and debating issues and ideas. For some, this is the essence of life, or at least of professional life, and without it, life looses its meaning, its savor, and its richness. These are likely to be among the more committed and productive members of the faculty, and their productivity and commitment are not going to diminish at any arbitrary age. It should be possible to negotiate a mutually beneficial relationship with this group, to enable them to continue the productive life they so much want, and to enable the institution to continue to reap the benefits of that productive professional life. Such an agreement might well provide the perquisites listed previously, and after all, most of them do not present incremental costs to the institution.

The point is that starting soon, faculty can continue to receive all these benefits, plus many more costly ones, as long as they wish and are able, simply by electing to delay retirement. Some of the benefits will advance the institution, e.g., listing of distinguished emeritus faculty in publications adds renown and attractiveness to the institution, and admitting emeriti to cultural, athletic, and academic events on the same basis as other faculty, swells the ranks of what may otherwise be poorly attended function and, if an admission charge is involved, swells the coffers as well.

Most important would be the role of emeriti in continuing their academic work, without the pressure of full time employment. Many faculty of retirement age are able to and would like to continue in their research (Blum 1988, Magnan 1988). Often this research brings prestige and funds to the institution, provides employment for assistants, provides support and scientific training and apprenticeship to graduate students, and provides a specific benefit to mankind, or in some way points to a practical application which will help raise the quality of life.

Emeritus faculty are often excellent teachers. With fewer peer pressures for professional advancement, they may have the time to spend with students, to monitor their progress, and to become a mentor rather than a supervisor. Emeritus faculty in our experience have often provided excellent help to graduate students in their thesis and dissertation research and writing.

Where emeriti serve as dissertations committee members, they often have the time and insight to devote to the student so that a success results. Their wisdom and long experience can help students overcome problems, a role often precluded by the pressures of being or becoming a recognized, tenured faculty member at a major university.

Emeritus faculty can be a rich resource for providing guest lectures in class, for providing speeches and workshops in their fields to community groups, or groups of young students and new faculty. They are often effective at communicating institutional goals to students, faculty, and administrators.

Emeritus faculty are often excellent ambassadors for the institution, presenting a picture of the institution that quietly and effectively communicates the institutional message. They are able and willing to help attract alumni interest, contacting alumni, often former students, soliciting alumni support, even in some cases, approaching major donors. To many emeritus faculty the chance to serve is often its own reward.

Emeritus faculty, who are no longer regular university employees, could be employed on a part-time, ad hoc, or consultant basis when appropriate services are performed. Many emeriti may not need or want payment for what they do, but others might, particularly where medical insurance benefits are possible.

Reimbursement for professional activities like travel to a professional meeting may be important to many emeritus faculty. In some cases, arrangements may be made so there is little direct cost to the institution. In many cases the principle of continuing meaningful association with the university for those who want it and have something to contribute, is more important than the money involved.

Planning for the new emeritus rank. There is little information at present on which to base generalizations about the roles emeritus faculty members are likely to have in the future. Therefore, institutional research might produce reliable and up-to-date information which could be particularly useful for planning purposes. A good place to start might be with several active emeritus or retired faculty and several interested employed faculty who command respect in the institution. Such a group, appointed by the college, or by the Faculty Senate, or jointly, could be charged with the responsibility of looking into the question and reporting back to the appointing authority.

Such a group might want to interview faculty and administrators, develop a survey, write to emeritus faculty associations at sister institutions, review the literature, and in general become familiar with the issues and possibilities available locally.

The actual privileges, obligations, and kind and degree of involvement of the emeritus professor in university affairs is quite inconsistent among universities, and the criteria used to determine which retirees are awarded emeritus rank differ markedly among institutions. Thus, understanding the differences, and coming to some appropriate agreement as to the definition of emeritus and consistent criteria for awarding the rank is one good place to start in the planning endeavor.

For individual institutions it seems important and timely to collect and analyze retirement and emeritus status data from institutional policies and practices, from the activities of faculty members, and on the current and future desires and intentions of both. Neither sound base line data nor meaningful projections are available nationally now. The systematic gathering, examination and reporting of such data at the institutional level would seem to be prudent and appropriate planning activity.

The imminent elimination of a mandatory age criterion for retirement can be anticipated to exert influence on retirement policies and practices in the near future. One example, which may well affect all faculty, is the standing of tenure.

The concern about the relationship of uncapping to tenure may be well-founded. It is held by both administration and faculty groups that the most difficult decisions in higher education today are those concerning the award of tenure (Miller 1987). Until recently it was certain that tenure stopped at a specific age, usually 65-70. That "cap" offered escape to faculty colleagues or administration from tenure award mistakes or changed circumstances. With uncapping, it may not be feasible to "wait-out" a problem tenure appointment until the individual decides to retire.

Tenure is being examined anew by some because the nature and length of permanent tenure will clearly be affected by the removal of the compulsory retirement age. Planning for the new emeritus rank would thus include ascertaining the number of tenured and non-tenured faculty by age, discipline, department, and projected retirement date. These data might then be compared with what is known about trends in student enrollments, institutional goals and emphases, which areas are to grow and expand, and which areas are to remain constant and perhaps decline. Planning for the future of the institution would seem to require some understanding of those numbers and their impact.

Further, planning for the new rank should take into consideration that intellectual and physical competence now extend, for many academic and professional men and women, beyond 62 or 65, common retirement ages previously established. In addition, the mandatory retirement option is now closed; that makes planning for uncapping all the more important. Institutions can allow themselves to be placed at the mercy of events, or they can plan to exert some direction over those events.

As a result of such planning, institutions may alter their policies and practices so as to change the previous "emeritus professor" image from an honorific rank of distinguished faculty to one accenting productivity as well. For many professors, retirement will no longer mean withdrawal from active work at the prime of one's academic career but a transition to a new, less pressure-filled, life and professional role.

Albert (1986, p. 25) reminds us that "retirement terminates neither experience nor expertise . . . ." He goes on to point out that if we allow "this act of disengagement to mean a severing of all ties between an institution and an emeritus [it] can only result in a measure of loss to both . . . ." In the future, institutions may plan ways for the option to be open to faculty to continue the scholarly work in all its in various aspects, but at a less hectic pace, and under newly negotiated terms of employment.

It would seem prudent for the individual institution to plan, with faculty, the specific nature of privileges and responsibilities that will be expected of emeritus faculty. Many such privileges and responsibilities are likely to be found among the list of possible roles found earlier in this paper. Many of these are privileges, and some faculty would even argue that they are or should be rights. However, it is likely that the future will be negotiated. Many of the items we have discussed above, as well as others, will be balanced in the sense that there will be both rights and responsibilities. What may start out as a list of demands which appear to benefit emeriti, may end up as a carefully planned and agreed upon role that is mutually beneficial.

CONCLUSIONS

1. There is a body of literature on the emeritus professorship that is limited in scope but still large enough and substantive enough to warrant more attention than it now receives in the journals and texts.

2. Emeritus faculty are in the process of building local, state and national organizations. The faculty are motivated by enlightened self interest and a desire for continued academic and professional engagement. They are now at the stage where they could either find a home on college or university campuses, or find recognition, attachment, or alliances elsewhere.

3. Sufficient information and experience is reported in the literature on emeritus status to encourage the design and implementation of a new concept of emeritus professor as a part-time faculty rank incorporated into the traditional working rank structure of the professorate.

4. Colleges and universities will have to find new ways to relate to older faculty while providing individual incentives for faculty members in keeping with institutional objectives. A promising way to do that is via the formalization of a working emeritus rank.

5. The time between now and 1994 constitutes a fortuitous window of opportunity in which to use the emeritus working rank as a means of cushioning the impact of uncapping. The window is narrowing day by day.

6. It is often noted in discussion on retirement age and retirement intentions that average age of faculty retirement is now markedly below age 70 and is falling. According to literature now available such an assumption may be open to question in some types of institutions. Moreover, average retirement age may be less relevant than is the mounting evidence that larger proportions and numbers of faculty intend to continue working beyond age 70.

7. Far too few institutions of higher education have sufficient information about faculty retirement intentions, either before or after uncapping, to make projections for local use or to determine state, regional, or national trends.

These conclusions are the major outcomes of the available literature. The next section deals with recommendations, most of which have their roots in the above conclusions. It must be concluded from the literature now available that such a discussion is needed and essential.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Individual institutions will find it necessary to collect and analyze retirement and emeritus status data from institutional policies and practices, from the activities of faculty members, and from the current and future desires and intentions of both.

Institutions should alter their policies and practices so as to change the previous "emeritus professor" image from a rank of retired faculty to a new form of working rank, part-time, equally distinguished, but accenting productivity as well. For many professors, retirement will no longer mean withdrawal from active work at the prime of one's academic career but a transition to a new, less hectic, life and professional role in the new emeritus rank.

Institutions should put real meaning and distinction into the emeritus rank and reserve it for active and interested faculty. Faculty then might be more likely to treat the rank as an opportunity to make addtitional contributions, rather than as an honorific title without responsibilities or challenges.

Colleges and universities, where appropriate, should enable older scholars to retire and to remain active in retirement by offering a working emeritus rank for those who want to remain active and productive but at a more relaxed pace. Among the enticements that could be recommended are office and laboratory space, secretarial help, library and parking privileges, and opportunities to teach, carry on research, and work with students part time. One of the biggest fears faculty have about retirement is that they will be cut off from colleagues and students, and the rich intellectual environment they are used to, and some such arrangement would allay that fear of retirement.

Institutions of higher education are advised to examine the roles emeritus faculty members are likely to have in the future. The research each institutional conducts might produce reliable and up-to-date information which could be useful for planning purposes.

Each institution should work to involve active emeritus or retired faculty, as well as currently employed faculty who command respect in the institution in the development of policies governing emeritus faculty. They could interview faculty and administrators, develop a questionnaire, write to emeritus faculty associations at sister institutions, review the literature, including this book, and in general become familiar with policies and issues locally.

Each institution, working with faculty, should search for ways to acknowledge voluntary emeritus faculty contributions in scholarship, research, teaching and service. The new relationship suggested here between institutions and emeritus faculty should be, if it is to be viable and lasting, mutually beneficial. Ideally both should gain.

There will have to be social and economic benefit to the new relationship if it is to remain healthy. Certainly some emeritus faculty feel so loyal to their schools that they may not wish to seek financial compensation for teaching, advising, consultation or other academic and professional contributions. And no doubt there are institutions that do not want to ask emeritus faculty to contribute their skills when there is little possibility of adequate pay. There are several options that might be recommended, most of which could result in dividends for both the institution and the emeritus faculty member. For example, the faculty member could be compensated financially, then make a gift to the institution. The emeritus faculty then enjoys the pleasure and prestige of recognition as a contributor to the institutional mission. The college or university can announce another faculty contribution and take advantage of the known encouragement that gives to other potential contributors.

Those faculty who wish to continue in an active, productive relationship with the institution should be given space and support (e.g. part-time secretary, telephone, supplies, part or full-time graduate assistance, computer or laboratory facilities) as appropriate. That form of recognition is usually highly prized by faculty members, yet it is relatively inexpensive when compared to a tenured faculty member's alternative of continued employment.

Highly recommended is the establishment and presenting of awards exclusively for extraordinary, otherwise uncompensated, contributions in scholarship, teaching, research or service by emeritus faculty. These represent only three of many possible ways to acknowledge the contributions of emeritus faculty.

Colleges and universities must address the issue of a fair and open annual system of evaluation for tenured faculty, worked out with faculty, and acceptable to both faculty and the administration.

Each institution should obtain its own information in anticipation of uncapping, as well as keep up with new studies being done, such as the congressionally mandated study by the National Academy of Sciences (Hammond & Morgan, 1991). Within each institution it may be time to study both the past retirement behavior and the future retirement intentions of faculty by categories, such as age, sex, race, academic discipline, and academic preparation.

SUMMARY

This paper was devoted to finding and to analyzing the professional literature on the emeritus professorship. It was anticipated that evidence might be found in the literature to suggest that significant changes were taking place in the meaning of emeritus status. Further it was postulated that the emerging changes in the meaning of the emeritus rank could be used to help manage problems foreseen in connection with the impending demise of a Mandatory Retirement Age (MRA) for tenured faculty in higher education.

The literature proved to be widely dispersed and quite varied in content. Much of it was either highly personal and anecdotal, or very speculative. There was, however, a core of research consisting mainly of studies of how emeriti spent their time, and studies about the relationship they had or desired with their former employing colleges and universities. In addition, there were reports of the activities of emeriti organizations and there were policy documents and bargaining agreements in which emeritus standing was recognized and described. To examine a possible relationship between emeritus status and retirement age, literature on the later was incorporated in the review also. A bibliography is provided.

REFERENCES

AAUP. January-February, 1988. "Statement on Principles on Academic Retirement and Insurance Plans." Academe, 74: 37-38.

___. July-August, 1987. "Working Paper on the Status of Tenure Without Mandatory Retirement." Academe, 73: 45-48. ___. September-October, 1982. "Uncapping the Mandatory Retirement Age." Academe, 68: 14a-18a.

___. 1940. "Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure." Washington: American Association of University Professors.

Albert, Sydney P. July-August, 1986. "Retirement: From Rite to Rights." Academe, 72: 24-26.

Auerbach, A. J. 1986a. "The Emeritus College: Boon or Boondoggle?"

___. Fall, 1986b. "Professors in Retirement: The Emeritus College Model." The College Board Review No. 141: 22-36.

___. 1984c. "Emeritus Professors: Engagement and Involvement." Educational Gerontology 10: 277-87.

Benjamin, Ernst. Spring, 1988. "Pensions, Retirement, and Tenure: What Can Faculty Expect in the Future?" In Footnotes. Washington: American Association of University Professors.

Benz, M. 1958. "A Study of Faculty and Administrative Staff Who Have Retired from New York University." Journal of Educational Sociology. 31: 282-293.

Bertelsen, Katherine Huggins. 1983. "Phased Retirement: A Way to Enhance Quality. "Paper read at Annual Meeting of Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration Knoxville, TN, November 13-15, 1983. ED 247652. 39 pp. MF PC.

Blackburn, J. O. and Schiffmann, S. 1980. "Faculty Retirement at the COFHE Institutions: An Analysis of the Impact of Age 70 Mandatory Retirement and Options for Institutional Response." Cambridge: Consortium on Financing Higher Education. ED233643. 90 pp. MF PC.

Blum, Debra E. 1989a. "Ban on Mandatory Retirement Age Not Likely to Affect Most Professors' Retirement Plans, Survey Finds." The Chronicle of Higher Education February 15, 1989.

___. 1989b. "Bargaining is Stalled among Professors Study Center Says." The Chronicle of Higher Education May 3, 1989.

___. 1988. "UCLA's Emeriti Association Shows 'There Is Life Beyond Retirement'." The Chronicle of Higher Education October 26, 1988. A16-A17.

Bowen, Howard R. and Schuster, Jack H. 1986. American Professors. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bowen, William G. and Sosa, Julie Ann. 1989. Prospects for Faculty in the Arts and Sciences: A Study of Factors Affecting Demand and Supply 1987 - 2012. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Brown, R. S. July-August, 1988. "1988 Report of the Council Committee on Retirement." Academe, 74: 34-35.

Chronister, J.L. and Kepple, Jr. 1987. Incentive Early Retirement Programs: Innovative Responses to a Changing Environment. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education. ED283478 MF PC.

Chronister, J.L. and Trainer, A. 1985. "Early, Partial, and Phased Retirement Programs in Public Higher Education." Journal of the College and University Personal Association 36: 27-31.

COFHE. 1989. COHFE Faculty Retirement Benefit Study 1988. Cambridge, MA: Consortium on Financing Higher Education.

Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure. July-August, 1987. "Working Paper on the Status of Tenure Without Mandatory Retirement." Academe 73: 45-48.

Committee on Aging. 1986. The Removal of Age Ceiling Cap under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act. House of Representatives, Ninety-Ninth Congress, Second Session. Washington, DC: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office. ED271704. 125pp. MF PC.

Covert-McGrath, Debra. 1984. "NACUBO Report: Early and Phased Retirement." Available from National Association of College and University Business Officers, One Dupont Circle, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20036. ED246743. 7pp.

Cronk, L. May-June, 1989. "Strings Attached." The Sciences 2:4.

Dillard, John. 1982. "Life Satisfaction of Nearly Retired and Retired Workers." Journal of Employment Counseling 19:131-34.

Dooris, Michael J. and Lozier, G. Gregory. 1987. "The Greying of Faculty: Challenges and Opportunities." A Presentation to the Society for College and University Planning, July 21, 1987.

Dorfman, Lorraine T. 1985. "Retired Academics and Professional Activity: A British-American Comparison." Research In Higher Education 22: 273-89.

___. 1984. "Reactions of Professors To Retirement: A Comparison of Retired Faculty from Three Types of Institutions." Research In Higher Education 20: 89-102.

___. 1982. "Retired Professors and Professional Activity: A Comparative Study of Three Types of Institutions." Research In Higher Education 17: 249-266.

___. 1981. "Emeritus Professors: Correlates of Professional Activity In Retirement II." Research In Higher Education 14: 147-60.

___. 1980. "Emeritus Professors: Correlates of Professional Activity In Retirement." Research In Higher Education 12: 301-16.

___. 1978. "Professors in Retirement: A Study of the Activities and Reactions to Retirement of University of Iowa Emeritus Faculty."

Finkin, Matthew W. Spring 1989. "Tenure After the ADEA Amendments: A Different View." In Mandatory Retirement: Effects on Higher Education, edited by Karen C. Holden and W. Lee Hansen. New Directions for Higher Education No. 65. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

___. 1988. "Commentary: Tenure After an Uncapped ADEA: A Different View." Journal of College and University Law 15: 43-61.

Gray, Kevin. 1989a. Retirement Plans and Expectations of TIAA-CREF Policy Holders. New York: TIAA/CREF.

___. May 9, 1989b. Personal communication. New York: TIAA/CREF.

Hammond, P.B. & Morgan, H.P., eds. 1991. Ending Mandatory Retirement for Tenured Faculty. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Hansen, Bernard L. 1985. "Election of Early Retirement and Other Flexibility Options by Ontario Faculty: Past, Present and Future." In The Professoriate: Occupation in Crisis, edited by Cicely Watson. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. ED265816.

Hansen, W. Lee. 1985. "Changing Demography of Faculty in Higher Education." In Faculty Vitality and Institutional Productivity, edited by Shirley M. Clark and Darrell R. Lewis. New York: Teachers College Press.

Havighurst, Robert J. 1985. "Aging and Productivity: The Case of Older Faculty." In Faculty Vitality and Institutional Productivity, edited by Shirley M. Clark and Darrell R. Lewis. New York: Teachers College Press.

Heller, Scott. 1986. "Colleges Ponder the Effects on Tenure of End to Mandatory Retirement at 70." Chronicle of Higher Education 33: 15, 18-19.

Hellweg, Susan and Churchman, Davis A. Fall 1981. "The Academic Tenure System: Unplanned Obsolescence in an Era of Retrenchment." Planning for Higher Education 10: 16-18.

Holden, Karen C. 1985. "Maintaining Faculty Vitality Through Early Retirement Options." In Faculty Vitality and Institutional Productivity, edited by Shirley M. Clark and Darrell R. Lewis. New York: Teachers College Press.

Holden, Karen C. and Hansen, W. Lee., eds. 1989a. The End of Mandatory Retirement: Effects on Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

___. 1989b. "Eliminating Mandatory Retirement: Effects on Retirement Age." In The End of Mandatory Retirement: Effects on Higher Education, edited by Karen C. Holden and W. Lee Hansen. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

___. 1989c. " Retirement Behavior and Mandatory Retirement in Higher Education." In The End of Mandatory Retirement: Effects on Higher Education, edited by Karen C. Holden and W. Lee Hansen. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Johnson, Diane. 1983. "The Academy of Independent Scholars: An Intellectual Resource of 'Proven Creativity'." Change 15: 41-43.

Kellams, Samuel and Chronister, Jay L. 1988. "Life After Early Retirement: Faculty Activities and Perceptions." Occasional Paper Series. Charlottesville, Virginia: Center for the Study of Higher Education.

Licata, Christine M. 1986. Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation: Threat or Opportunity? Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education. ED270009 MF PC.

Lozier, G. Gregory and Dooris, Michael J., eds. 1989. New Directions for Institutional Research: Managing Faculty Resources. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

___. 1988-1989. "Elimination of Mandatory Retirement: Anticipating Faculty Response." Planning for Higher Education 17: 1-14.

___. 1987. "Is Higher Education Confronting Faculty Shortages?" Paper read at Annual Meeting of Association for the Study of Higher Education, November

21-24, 1987. Baltimore, MD. Mimeo-graphed. University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University.

Mangan, Katherine S. 1988. "Colleges Offering Added Benefits to Retired Professors in Effort to Make Quitting Appeal to Older Scholars." The Chronicle of Higher Education October 26, 1988.

Mauch, James; Birch, Jack W. and Matthews, Jack. 1989a. "Emeritus Rank in Major Research Universities: Retiree Perquisites and Privileges." Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh.

___. 1989b. "Emeritus Status in Pennsylvania Colleges and Universities." Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh.

Miller, Richard I. 1987. Evaluating Faculty for Promotion and Tenure. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Milletti, Mario A. 1984. Voices of Experience: 1500 Retired People Talk About Retirement. New York: TIAA-CREF, Educational Research. ED249844. 201 pp. MF PC.

Mirel, Lawrence H. 1977. "Emeritus Status: Alternative to Retirement." Worklife 2 : 7-10.

Mitchel, Barbara A. 1981. "Early Retirement in Higher Education." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education Washington, DC, March 1981. ED 203 802 16 pp.

Monahan, Deborah J. 1987. "Predictors of Early Retirement Among University Faculty." Gerontologist 27: 46-52.

Montgomery, Sarah. 1989, Spring. "Findings from the COFHE Studies." In Mandatory Retirement: Effects on Higher Education, edited by Karen C. Holden and W. Lee Hansen. New Directions for Higher Education No. 65. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mooney, Carolyn J. 1987. "Expected End of Mandatory Retirement in 1990's Unlikely to Cause Glut of Professors, Study Finds." Chronicle of Higher Education 34: 1, 11.

Mortimer, K.P., Bagshaw, M. and Masland, A. 1985. " Flexibility in Academic Staffing: Effective Policies and Practices." ASHE-ERIC Higher Education No. 1, Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education. ED 260 675 MF PC.

Mulanaphy, James M. 1981. Plans and Expectations for Retirement of TIAA-CREF Participants. New York: TIAA/CREF.

Myers, Betty Jane and Pearson, Richard E. September, 1984. "Personal Perspective of Academic Professionals Approaching Retirement." New Directions for Teaching and Learning. 19: 67-74. Available from UMI.

Over, Ray. September, 1982. "Does Research Productivity Decline with Age?" Higher Education 7: 511-520.

Peterson, James A.; Small, Arnold M.; and Schneider, John. Undated "Survey of Retired Faculty and Staff Organizations of Universities and Colleges in the USA." Mimeographed. University Park, Los Angeles, California: University of Southern California.

Pifer, Alan and Bronte, D. Lydia. ed. 1986. Our Aging Society: A Challenge for the Future. New York: W. W. Norton.

Prochaska, Patricia. 1987. Age Discrimination in Employment: Current Legal Developments, CRS Report for Congress. Washington, DC: CRS, The Library of Congress.

Reskin, Barbara F. 1985. "Aging and Productivity: Career and Results." In Faculty Vitality and Institutional Productivity, edited by Shirley M. Clark and Darrell R.Lewis. New York: Teachers College Press.

Riley, Matilda White. July-August, 1986. "On Future Demands for Older Professors." Academe 72: 14-16.

Roe, A. 1965. "Changes in Scientific Activities with Age." Science 150: 313-318.

Roman, P. and Taietz, P. 1967. "Organizational Structure and Disengagement: The Emeritus Professor." The Gerontologist 7: 147-152.

Rowe, Alan R. 1976. "Retired Academics and Research Activity." Journal of Gerontology 31: 456-60.

Ruebhausen, Oscar M. Spring, 1989. "Implications of the 1986 ADEA Amendments for Tenure and Retirement." In Mandatory Retirement: Effects on Higher Education, edited by Karen C. Holden and W. Lee Hansen. New Directions for Higher Education No. 65. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

___. 1988. "The Age Discrimination in Employment Act Amendments of 1986: Implications for Tenure and Retirement." Journal of College and University Law 14: 561-574.

Ruebhausen, Oscar M. and Woodruff, Thomas C. July-August, 1986. "Retirement Programs for College and University Personnel." Academe 72: 8-13.

Soldofsky, Robert M. July-August, 1986. "On Determining the Optimal Retirement Age." Academe 72: 17-23.

___. 1984. "Age and Productivity of University Faculties: A Case Study." Economics of Education Review 3: 289-298.

Sumberg, Alfred D. Spring, 1989. "Tax Changes, Retirement and Pensions." In Mandatory Retirement: Effects on Higher Education, edited by Karen C. Holden and W. Lee Hansen. New Directions for Higher Education No. 65. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

TIAA-CREF. October, 1988. "Group Health Insurance Coverage of Retired Employees." Research Dialogues: No. 10.

___. July, 1988. "Voluntary Incentive Early Retirement Programs." Research Dialogues No: 16.

Trice, Mildred Moore. 1981. "Life Styles of Retired Professors." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.

U.S. Department of Labor. 1982. Final Report to Congress on Age Discrimination in Employment Act Studies. Washington, D.C.

Walker, George H., Jr. 1972. "Status of Phased Retirement in Higher Education." Mount Pleasant: Central Michigan University. ED054752. 8 pp. MF PC.

Weiler, William C. 1989. "Abolition of Mandatory Retirement." Educational Record Winter: 59-62.

Ycas, Martynas A. 1987. "Recent Trends in Health Near the Age of Retirement: New Findings from the Health Interview Survey." Social Security Bulletin 50: No. 2.